

ANGELICA BORMANN ET AL.  
USSN 09/557,376


things. First, Applicants seek a detailed response to the amendment dated June 27, 2002. The Advisory Action dated July 9, 2002, indicated that the prior art rejection was maintained, but did not specifically point out what were the errors in Applicants' arguments. Second, Applicants seek special consideration of new claims 28 and 29, and especially claim 29. The Bimczok reference teaches a method for treating wrinkles. The Examiner has taken the position that wrinkles constitute blemished skin. While Applicants respectfully disagree, presumably the Examiner would agree that wrinkles does not constitute acned skin. Therefore, claim 29 should at once be free of this rejection.

Early and favorable action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

NORRIS McLAUGHLIN & MARCUS, P.A.

By

  
Kurt G. Briscoe  
Reg. No. 33,141

220 East 42<sup>nd</sup> Street  
30<sup>th</sup> Floor  
New York, New York 10017  
Phone: (212) 808-0700  
Fax: (212) 808-0844